

REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are pending. Claims 1-60 have been rejected.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 14-16, 18-21, 23, 24, 27-29, 31-34, 36, 37, 40-42, 44-47, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,099) in view of Maher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,020). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 of the Applicants' claimed invention recites, *inter alia*, receiving a floor-control request from a user of the communication device who wishes to initiate a new group call and the communication device having released its traffic channel of the supporting wireless network.

This is in contrast to col. 10, lines 50-55 of Yao et al. that was specifically referred to in the Office Action, where after a remote unit initiates a connection, he sends a series of push-to-talk messages. When the pause between push-to-talk activations exceeds a threshold, the resources may be released. After the resources have been released, the remote unit sends an origination message on an access channel to reestablish a connection.

In Yao et al., the resources are released after the pause between push-to-talk activations exceeds a threshold. In the Applicants' claimed invention, the traffic channel is released after receiving a floor-control request from a user of the communication device who wishes to initiate a new group call. The operation of the Applicants' claimed invention does not require a threshold comparison to release the traffic channel as disclosed and taught in the Yao et al. patent.

Additionally, in the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Yao et al. fails to teach or suggest "encapsulating the received floor request in an Internet protocol (IP) datagram suitable for transmission via the Internet; and a corresponding group communication controller via the Internet."

The Examiner then provides Maher et al. as secondary reference in an attempt to make up for the deficiencies of the primary reference, Yao et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that Maher et al. does not teach or suggest the features that are claimed by the Applicant, nor does Maher et al. cure the deficiencies of Yao et al. as discussed above.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-13, 53 and 56 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented for independent claim 1 as well the additionally recited features found in these claims.

Claims 14, 27, 40 and 57-60 are independent claims that recite related subject matter to independent claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding independent claim 1 as well as the additionally recited features found in these claims.

Claims 15-26, and 54 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 14 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1.

Claims 28-39, and 55 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 27 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1.

Claims 41-52 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 40 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1.


CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 20, 2004

By: 
John L. Ciccozzi
Reg. No. 48,984
(858) 845-2611

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502